

REMARKS

Applicant has canceled claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 12 and 17 without prejudice, has amended claims 1, 7, 8, 11, and 15, and has added new claims 24-32.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 11-23 are Allowable

Applicant traverses with amendment the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-9, and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over US Patent No. 6,798,767 to Alexander, *et al.*, ("Alexander") at page 2, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 23.

Claim 1 recites associating an electronic device operable to receive a voice over internet protocol call with connection information, the connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device. The call receipt rule may be an internet protocol header rule (Claim 24), a real time transport protocol/real time control protocol rule (Claim 25), an allowable sample size rule (Claim 26), or a network access rule (claim 27), for example.

The Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses a "call receipt rule" at Col. 4, lines 63 through Col. 5, line 9. *See Office Action*, p. 2, paragraph 3. However, in the cited paragraph, Alexander states:

After call manager 26a has initiated the call, a codec (coder/decoder) converts the voice, video or fax signals generated by the users of the telephony devices from analog voice signals into digital form. The codec may be implemented either in software or as special-purpose hardware in IP telephony devices 22-24. In the case of an IP telephony device, as the user speaks into the handset, the codec converts the analog voice signals into digital data. The digitally encoded data is then encapsulated into IP packets so that it can be transmitted over LAN 20a.

See Alexander, Col. 4, line 63-Col. 5, line 9.

The cited paragraph of Alexander refers to a procedure performed by all IP devices of the LAN 20a during transmission of a call, and not a call receipt rule of a particular electronic device.

None of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest associating an electronic device with connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 1 and of claims 2 and 5, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1.

Claim 7 recites a mediation server maintaining an information store, the mediation server being independent of a communication link between callable devices. None of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest a mediation server maintaining an information store that is independent of a communication link between callable devices.

The Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses a mediation server maintaining an information store, citing to Col. 8, line 47 to Col. 9, line 20. *See Office Action*, p. 3, paragraph 3. Alexander discloses that the call manager 26 includes one or more mapping tables or databases 120. *See Alexander*, Col. 8, lines 47-48. Alexander also discloses that the call manager 26 sets up the call between a calling party and the target device. *See Alexander*, Col. 4, lines 42-46. The call manager 26 of Alexander is a connection manager that identifies if called devices are available and that routes the call traffic to the called device via the mapping tables. *See Alexander*, Col. 4, lines 38-50. Moreover, the call manager 26 is an application that controls call processing routing, telephone features and options of the IP telephony devices, and the call manager 26 controls IP telephony devices on the local area network and may also control IP telephony devices located across the wide area network. *See Alexander*, Col. 4, lines 26-34. Thus, the call manager 26 controls the IP devices to establish the call and is therefore part of the communication link between devices, and is not independent from the communication link.

Thus, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest a mediation server maintaining an information store that is independent of a communication link between callable devices, as

recited in claim 7. Therefore, Claim 7 is also allowable. Further, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the dependent claims 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 7.

Claim 15 recites querying a mediation server for the set of connection information, the mediation server maintaining a plurality of connection information sets for devices associated with the more than one managed network without becoming an interconnection point. As previously discussed, the call manager 26 of Alexander sets up the call between the calling party and the target device, and controls at least the IP telephony device of the local area network. *See Alexander*, Col. 4, lines 26-34 and 42-46. The call manager 26, which maintains the mapping tables, controls the IP telephony device and is thus part of the communication link. Thus, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest a mediation server that maintains connection information sets without becoming an interconnection point. Therefore, Alexander fails to disclose at least one element of claim 15, and of dependent claims 16-22, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 15.

None of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 23. For example, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest computer readable data to receive a query on behalf of a device of a *second* managed IP network, wherein the query seeks appropriate connection information for a called device associated with a *first* managed IP network. Moreover, Alexander fails to disclose or suggest computer readable data to initiate communication of the appropriate connection information to an address associated with the query.

In contrast to Claim 23, Alexander discloses a call manager 26 that uses mapping tables 120 to translate a telephone number into a network address. *See Alexander*, Col. 8, lines 52-55. The call manager 26 sets up the call. *See Alexander*, Col. 4, lines 42-47. Alexander makes no mention of receiving queries from a second managed IP network.

Additionally, calls initiation requests received from outside of the LAN are generated by the gateway 64 and routed to the call manager 26 to identify the target telephony device using

the mapping tables and to signal the target telephony device. *See Alexander*, Col. 10, lines 20-45. *Alexander* discloses that the call manager uses the mapping table 120 to identify a called device's associated extension number, and uses this association to signal the telephony device. *See Alexander*, Col. 9, lines 27-35. The extension numbers may be full NANP telephone numbers that can be directly dialed from PSTN 60. *See Alexander*, Col. 9, lines 39-41. The call manager signals non-IP telephony devices through the gateway, either directly or through one or more intermediate devices such as PBX 50, CO 62, and long distance network 66. *See Alexander*, Col. 9, lines 42-50. *Alexander* states:

For example, if call manager 26a wishes to ring PSTN telephony device 68, call manager 26a sends a message to gateway 64a using the gateway's IP address. This message contains the telephone number of PSTN telephony device 68. Gateway 64a retrieves the IP packets and determines the number to be rung. Gateway 64a then dials the telephone number of telephony device 68 (214-555-5002) over the CO trunk in order to ring telephony device 68. The terms "dial" or "ring" should be interpreted generically to indicate any signal sent from gateway 64a indicating a request to connect to telephony device 68.

See Alexander, Col. 9, lines 50-60.

Thus, the call manager of *Alexander* uses the mapping tables to retrieve the connection information and then connects the call. The connection information is not communicated to the address associated with the query, as recited in claim 23. For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 23 is allowable.

Claims 5 and 10 are Allowable

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Alexander* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0180646 ("Donley") at page 6, paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action. As previously discussed, *Alexander* fails to disclose at least one element of each of the independent claims 1 and 7. The Office Action fails to establish that the asserted combination discloses or suggests each of the elements of the independent

claims, and therefore fails to establish that the asserted combination discloses or suggests all of the elements of claims 5 and 10.

The Office Action acknowledges that Alexander fails to disclose or suggest receiving credentials from a party making the request. *See Office Action*, p. 7, paragraph 5. The Office Action asserts that it would be obvious to combine Alexander with Donley, which discloses use of credentials. *See Office Action*, p. 7, paragraph 5.

However, Donley fails to disclose or suggest associating an electronic device with connection information comprising a unique address and a call receipt rule of the electronic device, as recited in claim 1. Donley is directed to a presence aware network 100 with a plurality of communication devices 124a-n and 128a-n, each of which may be configured automatically with different sets of preferences based on which user is using the device. *See Donley*, Abstract. The preferences of Donley are user preferences and not a call receipt rule of the electronic device. Similarly, Donley fails to disclose or suggest a mediation server maintaining an information store, the mediation server being independent of a communication link between callable devices, as recited in claim 7. In contrast to claim 7, Donley discloses a memory 140 that is within the telephony switch/server 108 within the communication link. *See Donley*, Fig. 1, for example. Therefore, the asserted combination of Alexander and Donley fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 5 and 10, at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 7.

New claims 24-32 are allowable.

New claims 24-32 are added. No new matter is added, and none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claims 24-32. Therefore, claims 24-32 are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, and 18-32.


Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

12-2-2005
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)